

ORIGINAL



0000174240

Memorandum

From the office of
Chairman Doug Little
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. WASHINGTON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA
(602) 542-0745

RECEIVED
AZ CORP COM
DOCKET CONTROL
2016 OCT 26 PM 4:11


TO: Docket Control
DATE: October 26, 2016
FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office
SUBJECT: SSVEC E-01575A-15-0312

Chairman Little's office received 9 emails referencing, and in opposition of, the above docket number. The correspondence can be viewed in Docket, or on the Commission website via the eDocket link.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

OCT 26 2016

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	---

Andrea Gaston

From: Dale Murphy <drjdm88@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2016 2:31 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Fwd: SSVEC rate case hearing
Attachments: ACC 10-27-16 Open Meeting agenda.pdf; ATT00001.htm E-01575A-15-0312

MESSAGE

Commissioners: I am a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the rate case before you.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- REJECTING SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers NOT be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while INCREASING that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.
- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

Sincerely,

Dale & Janet Murphy Sierra Vista, AZ.

Andrea Gaston

From: Annie McGreevy <anniemcgreevy@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2016 11:06 AM
To: Little-Web; RBurns-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; Tobin-Web
Subject: SSVEC Rate case hearing E01576A-15-0312

Commissioners: I am a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the rate case before you.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- REJECTING SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers NOT be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while INCREASING that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.
- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

Annie McGreevy
32 Fort Crittenden Road
Sonoita, AZ 85637

Andrea Gaston

From: Timothy Doyle <tedoyle@cox.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2016 11:11 AM
To: Little-Web; RBurns-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; Tobin-Web
Subject: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. (E-01575A-15-0312) rate case

Importance: High

October 22, 2016
2310 E Suma Dr.
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

Commissioner: I am a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. (E-01575A-15-0312) rate case before you on October 27, 2016.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- REJECTING SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers NOT be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while INCREASING that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.
- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

Sincerely,

Timothy Doyle

Andrea Gaston

From: Davis Leah <leah@sanfili.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2016 12:32 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: SSVEC rate case hearing. *E-01675A-15-0312*

Dear Mr. Little,

I am a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the rate case before you.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- **REJECTING** SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers **NOT** be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while **INCREASING** that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.

- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

Sincerely,

Leah D. Davis, Sierra Vista, Arizona

Andrea Gaston

From: getzwiller <getzwiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2016 6:51 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: SSVEC Rate Case *E-0575A-15-0312*

Honorable Commissioner Little:

I am a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the rate case before you.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- REJECTING SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers NOT be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while INCREASING that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.
- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

One thing that is often missed is the fact tht DG owners in our area are many miles from the coal fired plant in Willcox. We provide a very important service to the other users in our area by providing locally generated energy to them, with no line loss. This is extremely cheap energy for SSVEC, as they pay approximately 3 cents per watt, which is the best value they can get for energy, because there is no line loss - or maintenance and upkeep for our facilities that provide it.

They may lose this energy if and when battery back up is made available - and these DG providers disconnect - if SSVEC continues to mistreat these customers.

Sincerely,

Steve and Gail Getzwiller

getzwiller@gmail.com
PO Box 815
Sonoita, AZ 85637
520-455-5020

Andrea Gaston

From: Gary Smith <garys30@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2016 7:29 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: E-01575A-15-0312

Commissioner: I am a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the rate case coming soon before you.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- REJECTING SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers NOT be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while INCREASING that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.
- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

Sincerely,

Gary Smith
237 S Meadowood LN
Sierra Vista, AZ

Andrea Gaston

From: Jerry W. Jones <jjones341@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2016 6:30 PM
To: Little-Web; RBurns-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; Tobin-Web
Subject: SSVEC rate case hearing E-01575A-15-0312

Commissioners: I am a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the rate case before you.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- REJECTING SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers NOT be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while INCREASING that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.
- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. In fact, SSVEC encouraged installation of solar. I was provided an incentive. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

Sincerely,

Jerry W. Jones
1655 San Gabriel Ave
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635

Andrea Gaston

From: Loyd R. Ganey, Jr., Ph. D. <drganey@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 7:53 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: SSVEC Rate Case Hearing E01575A-15-0312

Chairman Doug Little:

Greetings. I am a long time resident of Sierra Vista (25 years), a retired US Army Veteran (25 years), and a DG-solar system owner in the Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) service area and am writing regarding the rate case before you.

I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE you to accept these recommendations from Judge Belinda Martin:

- REJECTING SSVEC's attempt to set a retroactive grandfathering date of April 15, 2015, and setting as default Commission policy that any grandfathering policies will be effective only on the date of the Commission's final decision.
- Directing that DG-solar customers NOT be segregated into a separate rate class but be treated the same as other residential customers.
- Rejecting SSVEC's claim that DG-solar customers are the sole cause of the \$1.13M "under-collection" the co-op reported in 2014. (I would remind you that during that "test year," SSVEC still made \$7M above their expenses.)
- Directing that determining the rates for DG-solar customers be delayed into a second phase of this case that will begin only after the Value of Solar rate case is completed.
- Directing that any new Net Metering tariff for DG customers, and for that matter any other rate changes, be phased in over time.

I generally support the concept of adjusting service availability and energy charges to better reflect the costs these charges are meant to pay for, but I would remind the Commission that even the residential rate structure Judge Martin recommends approving will reward those who use more energy than average by actually lowering what they pay in their combined service availability and energy fees while INCREASING that amount for those who use less energy. If SSVEC is genuinely interested in encouraging customer and energy savings, this should be reversed.

I would also encourage you to support the following ACC staff recommendations:

- Moving to fewer inter-class subsidies.
- New Service Charges roll-out and handling recommendations: informing customers of service costs in advance, placing all service charges on SSVEC's website, not charging customers for issues on the co-op side of meter or for normal maintenance. These practices should be models for these and other types of changes.

DG-solar customers are not SSVEC's enemy. We deserve to be treated with respect and charged rates that are reasonable and appropriate. Judge Martin's and the staff's recommendations above move this case in that direction for all SSVEC residential customers and I again encourage you to support them.

Sincerely,

Dr. Loyd R. Ganey, Jr.
and
Mrs. Gerlinde J. Ganey

Andrea Gaston

From: David Grieshop <dgrieshop@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2016 5:14 AM
To: Little-Web
Cc: RBurns-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; Tobin-Web
Subject: Hearing on SSVEC rate case; October 27-18, 2016 E-01575A-15-0312

Gentlemen,

the rate case hearing you will conduct has been contentious since April 2015 when SSVEC basically notified its membership (with less than one week's notice) that it effectively wanted to "kill" future Distributed Generation (DG) future programs in its service area.

This was most unfortunate for two reasons: first, this created class-warfare between the "solar haves" and the "solar have-nots"; and second, SSVEC was essentially wanted to squander the competitive advantage enjoyed in (especially) southern Arizona where the incidence of solar radiation is so high for DG or even large scale solar projects.

The ACC staff, fortunately, converted SSVEC's notice into a rate case which you will be hearing next week.

I believe most of what Judge Belinda Martin recommended in her report is reasonable although clarity was not a strong suit in the report. Specifically, she rejected SSVEC's claim DG solar members were the cause of the \$1.3M under collection; and, requiring any rates for DG solar customers be delayed until the Value of Solar rate case is completed.

That said, I believe you gentlemen have a much bigger issue to consider. That is, in the aggregate will the ACC squander the competitive solar advantage Arizona has going forward? Study after study has shown Arizona to be ranked #2 or #3 in solar productivity. To my mind, that is the fundamental decision you are addressing. Your decision, for not only the SSVEC case but future cases, will have major ramifications for homeowners as well as business in the years and decades ahead.

Whether you are blessed or cursed by hearing the SSVEC rate case less than three weeks before our national elections of November 8th, I do not know. But, in any event I wish you well next week.

Best regards,

David S. Grieshop
Sierra Vista